

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 19, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-4, 8-14, 17-19, 21, and 23 have been amended. Further, claim 24 will have been newly submitted for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 1-23 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-17 and claims 22-23 include allowable subject matter.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for minor informalities. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification by changing "support sphere" to "link connecting part," and by changing "link0" to "link." Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the term "support sphere" is misleading. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 18 and 19 by changing "sphere" to "link connecting part," and requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-23.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,098,243 (hereinafter "*Kim*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,689 (hereinafter "*Roney et al.*") and U.S. Patent No. 2,601,698 (hereinafter "*Humphrey*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Roney et al.*, *Kim* or *Humphrey*,

either singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every element recited in claim 18.

For example, claim 18 recites, inter alia, a "...bushing installed on an outer circumference of the driving shaft roller..." The Examiner admits that *Kim* does not teach a "bushing" and further relies upon *Roney et al.* for supplying the deficiencies of *Kim*. In particular, the Examiner asserts that *Roney et al.* discloses a "bushing 46 installed on the outer circumference of the driving shaft" (page 3 of Official Action).

However, Applicant submits that element 46 in *Roney et al.* is a "sleeve hinge" and not a "bushing". More specifically, *Roney et al.* discloses that the sleeve hinge 46 "provides the pivotal connection between the cannister assembly 12 and nozzle assembly 14" (column 4, lines 65-66). That is, the "sleeve hinge", as disclosed by *Roney et al.*, is not a "bushing".

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable for the combination of features recited therein, including, for example, "...a fixing panel being penetrated by a bushing..." and "...a rotational driving part revolving around the bushing...". Moreover, Applicant submits that *Kim*, *Roney et al.*, and *Humphrey*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose at least these claimed features.

In addition, claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim* in view of *Humphrey*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection and submits that it is inappropriate at least since neither *Kim* or *Humphrey*, either singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every element recited in claim 19. For example, claim 19 recites "a rotation guide ... positioned outside the driving shaft roller and guided coaxially with the driving shaft roller." Neither *Kim* nor *Humphrey* teaches this limitation.

The Examiner found that a "rotational guide" is taught by the guide long hole 15 of *Kim* in Figure 5a, and a "driving shaft roller" is taught by the motor roller 4 of *Kim* in Figure 4. However, Applicant submits that the guide long hole 15 in *Kim*, which was asserted to be a "rotation guide," is not "guided coaxially" with the motor roller 4 of *Kim*, which was asserted to be driving shaft roller.

Claim 19 also recites "a support sphere and a roller support part ... parallel with the driving shaft roller on an outer circumference of the rotation guide." Neither *Kim* nor *Humphrey* teaches this limitation. While the Examiner contends that the "belt shaft" 6 is the "roller support part," Applicant submits that the belt shaft is not formed on an outer circumference of the guide long hole 15, which was interpreted by the Examiner as being the "rotation guide".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is patentable over *Kim* in view of *Humphrey* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Likewise, claims 20 and 21, which depend from claim 19, are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that new claim 24 is allowable for the combination of features recited therein.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant's representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees

Application No.: 10/608,099

Docket No.: 7986.005.00-US

required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicants